New York Tribune.

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden M. Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Secretary and Treasurer. Address Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. $ .75	Daily only, 1 month...$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos. 4.25	Daily only, 6 months.. 3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year. 8.50	Daily only, 1 year..... 6.00
Sunday only, 6 months 1.25	Sunday only, 1 year.... 2.50

FOREIGN RATES DAILY AND SUNDAY.		CANADIAN RATES DAILY AND SUNDAY:	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY:		DAILY ONLY:	
Six months	3.33	One month	.50
One year	6.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY:		SUNDAY ONLY:	
One month	1.29	One month	.50
One year	15.39	One year	4.55

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Joffre's "Nibbling."

Early in the war there was attributed to General Joffre a statement which caught the fancy of the world, but at the time carried very little enlightenment. Asked if the French offensive had begun seriously he had replied—"No, I am just nibbling." But in March and April the word came to have a far more serious and sinister connotation than at first. Indeed, it seems now, to the European critics, to mean precisely what Grant described as "attrition." Grant's policy had been from 1864 to the end, as he described it, "to hammer continuously against the armed force of the enemy and his resources until by mere attrition, if in no other way," the South should be subdued.

An examination of the actions in the Champagne, at Neuve Chapelle, has satisfied Hilaire Belloc, the most eminent of British war critics, that Allied strategy in the west is now undertaking a policy of attrition, which every American must necessarily associate with the methods of the greatest of the generals of the North.

To be successful a policy of attrition presupposes a superiority of numbers with the general taking the offensive. This the French, with their British and Belgian allies, have. French official reports continue to place the German strength in the West at forty-seven corps, or substantially 2,000,000 men. But the strength of the French, Belgian and British, with the reserve formations and troops in the depots, cannot be less than 4,000,000, and is bound to grow as the British contingents arrive.

The theory of Belloc, sustained by much evidence, is that the Germans now lack the numbers sufficient to maintain a reserve equal to that of the Allies at all points. Thus, when the French made their great attack in the Champagne in February and March, German troops were presently found here which had been before the British about La Bassée a few days earlier. On the theory that the Germans had weakened their line in Flanders to support their troops in Champagne, the British attacked at Neuve Chapelle and won a considerable victory, despite mismanagement.

Again, and later, a violent French offensive having developed about the St. Mihiel salient and German reserves having been called up, new French offensives in Alsace and about Arras won material successes. All this tends to support the Belloc theory, the theory of British and French observers generally, that German reserves are inferior in number to the French and British, and to meet a local attack the Germans are thus compelled to weaken their whole battle front.

The theory of attrition, of Joffre's "nibbling," is disclosed to Belloc in the operations at Neuve Chapelle. First there is an enormous and measurably secret concentration of artillery at the point selected for attack. Then a tremendous bombardment, which silences the opposing artillery and destroys the enemy's trenches. Under cover of this artillery and before the enemy has recovered from the storm there is a general advance, and the enemy's trenches are occupied and organized to resist a counter attack.

So far the losses may be held to be fairly equal. But now the enemy, bringing up his reserves, endeavors to retake his old positions under fire of an artillery still superior and an infantry occupying his old trenches. Here he suffers very great losses, and his casualty list at the end of the fight exceeds that of the Allies. This was the case at Neuve Chapelle, if the British figures for German losses be accepted; that is, if it be believed, as Field Marshal Sir John French insists, that the German loss was nearly 20,000. The British was 13,000. But the German claim is that their own loss was but 6,000. To support the British figure is the "eye-witness" assertion that nearly 3,000 Germans were buried on the field after the fight.

At St. Mihiel, if the French bulletins are accepted, and they have the air of accuracy lacking in the German, because they give in detail the ground captured and the time of taking with circumstantial particulars, while the German statement is merely a general denial, the procedure was the same. The French seized the heights of Les Eparges after sharp fighting and then beat off a long series of counter attacks which cost the Germans a terrible loss. This is again confirmatory of Belloc's theory and an example of Joffre's "nibbling."

Now, in the Civil War Grant's policy of attrition in Virginia was supplemented after his army went south of the James by a second method. Week by week he stretched his lines eastward as his reinforcements came up. Lee, compelled to extend his lines in the same way, finally stretched them until, as he had long expected, they became too thin, and in the last days of March Grant broke them in three places and opened the drive to Appomattox. Unless the Germans can presently bring forward new reserves it must be clear that Joffre's tactics will have a similar result.

At Neuve Chapelle the British actually penetrated the German lines. Conceivably, to judge from British reports, had the reserves been well handled more than local advantages might have been gained. French success in the last few days in Alsace is another indication of the weakening of German resistance. But above all the failure of the Germans to take the offensive anywhere in the West in recent weeks seems to demonstrate that they lack the numbers for anything but defensive fighting, and even here are hard put to it, as all the recent struggles would indicate, to hold their own.

If this interpretation of Allied strategy be true, if the Germans in France are actually and permanently to remain inferior in numbers, then instead of any general Allied offensive all along the line, the "spring drive" so much advertised, what is to be expected is a long series of "nibbles," of operations wholly similar to those in Champagne, in Flanders, in Lorraine and in Alsace. So long as Allied losses do not exceed German, the cost to the Germans will be greater proportionately, and the time must come when they will have to retire to shorter lines, presumably behind the Meuse and the Scheldt.

Meantime the immediate effect of this strategy is to pin down in their positions all the German troops in France, save the small reserves which are hurried from danger point to danger point, and there can be no shifting of army corps east and west in France or from France to the Russian front, as in the past. This, so far as it is possible to judge, has already happened.

In sum, recent events seem to confirm the views of official and unofficial observers that the Germans have been put on the defensive permanently in France, and the ablest British critic, Belloc, finds warrant for the belief that the strategy of Joffre is really an imitation of Grant's method, which ultimately disposed of Lee, a policy of attrition, for which "nibbling" is but a euphemism, as the casualty lists disclose.

No Favors to the Canners!

The latest attempt to scuttle the labor law in favor of the canneries, which Governor Whitman is said to have consented to approve, is no better than the Bewley bill, which he refused to sign. It would accomplish exactly the same thing in permitting the forced labor of women and minors. It would give to the canners exactly what they want exactly as they want it, and the burden of proof that they were violating the law or evading it would be laid on the Labor Department under such circumstances that proof would be almost impossible to obtain.

"Emergencies" such as the canners who ask this legislation tell of are properly provided for in the existing law. These emergencies, of late-delivered produce, of early ripened vegetables, causing a glut of canning material, of unexpectedly large crops and the like, are common to all canners. Labor Commissioner Lynch declares that a majority of the canners obey the present law, which is proof that it is not unreasonable. Where it is disobeyed it is because "of the individual canner's attitude toward it and not of the necessary exigencies of his business."

To change this law, therefore, would be to repeal a reasonable, enlightened statute drawn to protect women and children against brutal and inhuman exploitation, for the benefit of a few canners who now are lawbreakers because of greed. Common sense and humanity revolt at the thought. The present law should not be changed. It should be preserved and enforced rigidly.

If Tammany Goes Uptown.

One of the real landmarks of this city will disappear if the Tammany Society decides to trek from its present headquarters, in East Fourteenth Street. Tammany Hall—say what one will about its architecture or the morals and manners of the political organization which it shelters—is one of New York's historical buildings. Its fame is far more nation-wide than that of any other structure we can boast of hereabouts, except, perhaps, the Brooklyn Bridge or Bartholdi's Statue of Liberty.

Tammany removed from the Sun Building to Fourteenth Street in 1868, and the new hall was opened for the entertainment of a Democratic national convention. It was there that Horatio Seymour made his famous declaration: "Your candidate I cannot be." Nevertheless, not many hours later he did become the Presidential nominee of the convention.

From Andrew Johnson's time to Woodrow Wilson's the Hall has been a focus of variegated Democracy—near Democracy, tattooed Democracy and triumphant Democracy, always of ravenous and commercialized Democracy.

Mr. Wilson, when a candidate for the Presidential nomination, wrote a polite note to the sachems intimating that on the hearthstone of Tammany Hall the fire of liberty had been kept always burning. After he became President, however, he positively declined to furnish any fuel in the shape of Federal patronage with which to feed that flame of patriotism.

With a Federal administration, a state administration and a city administration all out of sympathy with Tammany's aspirations, it seems an ill-chosen moment in which to construct a bigger hall with a more spacious hearthstone. Going north, Tammany will desert that section of the city in which its strength has been most concentrated. It will cut the acquaintance of the lower East Side and the Bowery. It may get domiciled more comfortably uptown, but it can never hope to rear in that more sophisticated political area a temple which will symbolize what it is and what it lives for as adequately and fittingly as did the bold and frowning headquarters of Tweed, Kelly, Croker and Murphy in East Fourteenth Street.

Tax Rate Reflections.

Mayor Mitchel and President McAneny are agreed that if the Republican Legislature follows its present programme the tax rate next year will be 2.15 instead of 1.90, a 25 point raise.

This means that next year, when there will be a President and a Governor to elect, the Republicans of this town will have to deal with an electorate which is facing the substantial fact of an enormous expansion of the tax rate, with an inevitable concomitant increase in city rents.

The taxpayers of New York City will know that this increase is due to the wilful extravagance of a Republican Legislature determined at all costs to acquire patronage for political purposes. They will know that it represents the cost of paving streets in rural communities, of clearing out frog ponds in county districts, of every conceivable kind of waste which might benefit deserving Republicans.

They will know also that, as Senator Brown has indicated, an increase in the state budget from $49,000,000 to $69,000,000 this year is only a preliminary to raising it from $69,000,000 to $80,000,000 if other "comfortable Republican sessions" are to follow.

They will know, further, that in the hope of obtaining a few of the 10,000 new jobs to be created this year the local Republican leaders, Samuel S. Koenig and Jacob A. Livingston, have made not a single protest against plundering the city treasury.

They will recall that in the Legislature, while seven Republican Senators and twenty Republican Assemblymen sat silent, only Tammany Democrats raised their voices in defence of the City of New York.

All these circumstances may combine to rouse the enthusiasm of this community for Republican candidates. The promise of a new $10,000,000 to be added to the budget if a Republican state administration be chosen in 1916 may persuade them to vote as one man for Republican candidates and another 15 points added to the city tax rate.

Patently this is what Republican leaders at Albany expect. Unmistakably this is what local Republican leaders and legislators look forward to. Perhaps it will happen. A great majority of the voters of this town may believe a Republican state administration is cheap at any price, but unless this can be established, is the present legislative game worth the candle?

The peace terms which Dr. Dernburg talks about are neither those which Germany would impose, if victorious, nor those which she would have to accept, if defeated. They are not even those which a draw would logically entail. The dove of peace is not caught by such offerings of dialectical sawdust.

If the direct tax is translated into higher rents in this city the results of the Legislature's session will hardly be as "comfortable" to the Republican organization as Senator Brown once said they were going to be.

Baseball may seem mild to Huerta compared to bullfighting, but he ought to have seen an old-style football game!

The first "poisoned needle" yarn of spring has made its appearance.

Wellington's Height.

From The Manchester Guardian.

To think of the Duke of Wellington as a little man is almost as difficult as to think of Napoleon as a big one. Yet a heated controversy occupies the correspondence columns of "The Spectator" as to whether there was much to choose in height between the two. The duke was "very little, if at all, taller than Napoleon," says the writer of an article in a recent issue, and this week a surprising number of people who knew the duke or lived as children with some one who was his intimate friend hasten to rebut the attack on his inches. The belittling school quote Thomas Carlyle, whose eye for physical characteristics was a keen one, and who described the duke in 1850 as "a shortish, slightish man." But the duke was getting old then, and the stoop that marked him even as a young man may have increased. The people who will not have him less than medium height have better evidence to go on. One of them lived "in constant association with him" till she was eighteen, at the house of the parents of another he was a "constant visitor," a third frequently saw him riding in the park, and all claim 5 feet 9 inches or more for him. It is a curious thing that while the stature of Julius Cæsar, for instance, is not in dispute we should be in doubt about that of so comparatively recent a hero as Wellington.

The Home First.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Referring to your editorial of this morning, "Home-Destroying Ballots," it would appear from the diary of Mrs. Sammis that the giving of votes to women involves only the casting of the ballot, in which thought you seem to concur. On this point a number of people, including myself, differ from the advocates of woman's suffrage.

The news item about offices for women in Chicago shows to my mind what will naturally follow if women are given the ballot. A number of women would undoubtedly demand office and others would have offices tendered them for political purposes. Do you think this further invasion of man's sphere will tend to keep the home life, which you will admit is the foundation of our social life, intact? Will it not make marriage less attractive to women?

We "antis" do not contend that woman's activities should be confined to the home entirely, but we do say that home should have first place, and believe that it will be subordinated to a large extent if she receives the ballot. F. C. SCUDDER.

Babylon, N. Y., April 16, 1915.

NOT GOING, BUT APPROVES OF IT.

PREREQUISITES OF PEACE

Letters Exchanged by Charles W. Eliot and G. L. Stowell.

Mr. Charles W. Eliot.

Sir: It is unnecessary to tell you that the only protection against a bloody return to the predatory instincts exhibited in the European war is the erection of an international tribunal similar in principle to the courts of individual states, whose decrees shall be rendered authoritative by a background of regulated force. It must be a tangible, embodied force, and, in the last resort, a military force.

How such a force can be constituted and applied has been the problem ever since the days of the Amphictyonic Councils. Vague public sentiment is no substitute for it, nor public indignation, ostracism, embargo and the like.

No. Public opinion is a force mandatory in a homogeneous community, where the individual knows that his fellows can and will follow up reprobation by more painful forms of pressure, or where there exists the terror of a universal church, as in the excommunications of the Middle Ages; but, as among nations widely separated in customs, laws, standards and ideals, its power is almost nil. There has, for instance, been but one real opinion outside of Germany in regard to the violation of Belgium: But what neutral nation has protested against it? In this country there has been more official concern over questions of commerce than at the destruction of a principle, the sanctity of treaty obligations, without which no country can rest in peace and security.

Is there, then, any possibility of international law being respected for itself until some nation stands forth the champion of Law as Law in a matter where that nation's own private interests are not immediately concerned?

It is to the intense regret of many of us (a number increasing every day, I believe) that the United States, as the most powerful neutral, did not, in the name of the sanctity of protective treaties, protest at the outrage on Belgium. For, if we had protested, it would have been a new and greater Declaration of Independence in behalf of all weaker peoples—a rallying cry for future united effort. It would have established the principle of outside interference in a matter of basic international law. It is absolutely necessary to get established some such principle, on an issue easily understood, with neutral force behind it. And what cause for action could have been clearer, more universally recognized, more surgent of popular feeling, than was the violation of Belgium?

The time for that dramatic and epoch-making form of protest has passed; yet there still remains the principle to be contended for, viz., that in the final adjustments of the war Belgium shall regain her full rights. There is danger of this being overlooked. For the sympathy of the world has been so deeply moved by her miseries that the popular mind may grow weary and fail to recognize her claims as the vindicator of a principle.

As soon as it becomes evident to the controllers of Germany that she cannot win, they will begin to cast about for the most favorable terms of peace, and I fear there will be a large party in this country willing to accept almost any conditions that will end the war. The very last ground that Germany would consent to relinquish would be Belgium, and that should be the very first condition of treating with her. Better a long drawn out war than the entail of a crime of such magnitude. It seems to me that this thought ought to be impressed *now* upon the American pople, reiterated in season and out of season, that whatever else may be compromised for the sake of peace the principle of the sanctity of treaty obligations toward weaker states shall be vindicated. To condense it into a single phrase: No discussion of peace with Germany until she has evacuated Belgium!

G. L. STOWELL.

New York, March 26, 1915.

Dear Mr. Stowell: I cordially agree with you that there must be a military and naval force behind the international council or league. Public opinion will not answer, and neither will the threat of non-intercourse. I have been preaching that doctrine ever since last September. But two classes of persons refuse to accept it—first, the extreme pacifists, and, secondly, the people who think that no such council or league is possible, and that no such international force would, as a matter of fact, be maintained.

The most serious difficulty in regard to the creation of such an international agreement is the conspicuous fact that no reliance whatever could be placed on Germany as a faithful member of such a league. As yet nobody sees the way out of this supreme difficulty. A few publicists and authors in England are attempting to formulate a scheme for the establishment of an international body with power to prevent international war in Europe; but this group is wrestling in vain with the problem of German faithlessness.

It is very true, as you say, that no neutral nation has protested against the outrage on Belgium; but the reason for the failure to protest is, I think, not a discreditable one. It has been evident, from last August till now, that the American people have not made up their minds that the United States must enter this war. No protest from the government of the United States would have had the least effect on Germany unless it was couched in such terms that Germany could see that her refusal to regard the protest meant war with the United States.

I am not a "peace at any price" man, and I printed last October the statement that we ought to go into the war if England or France showed signs of exhaustion. They show no such signs as yet. Moreover, it would be much more wholesome for Europe all alone to prove to Germany that she cannot win a dominating position in Europe or the world, and to give that demonstration without any assistance from the United States or any other American nation. If England, France, Russia and Italy, with one or two of the Balkan States, can defeat Germany and Austria-Hungary without assistance from us there will be more hope for future peace and good will in Europe than if the forces of the United States have to be brought into the fight.

I entirely agree with you that it would be a huge calamity for the war to end without complete indemnity for Belgium from Germany. I believe that to be the opinion of an immense majority of the American voters. I have been in the habit of stating the matter in this way—no peace until Germany is driven back on to her own soil on both east and west fronts. CHARLES W. ELIOT.

Cambridge, Mass., March 27, 1915.

Civil War Gun-Running.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In view of the fact that you exposed an attempt of several honorable gentlemen to obtain old government rifles to sell at a profit to European governments, perhaps some of your readers may be interested in the following bit of history:

In 1861 5,000 condemned carbines lay in the government arsenal in New York City. Government officials had condemned these carbines in 1857 as being so bad that they would shoot off the thumbs of the soldiers who used them.

Arthur M. Eastman, of Manchester, N. H., offered the government $3 apiece for the condemned rifles. They were sold to him for $3.50 apiece. Simon Stevens, a Tammany politician, backed Eastman to the extent of $20,000. Stevens obtained the funds from J. Pierpont Morgan.

The 5,000 condemned rifles were sold to General Fremont, commanding at St. Louis, upon the representation that they were good, new rifles. Fremont paid $22 each for the rifles, notwithstanding the fact that the government was then paying $17.50 for rifles of the best pattern.

In 1862 Secretary of War Stanton appointed a commission which completely exposed this fraud. "The government," reported the commission, "not only sold one day for $17,486 arms which it had agreed the day before to repurchase for $109,912, making a loss to the United States of $92,426, but virtually furnished the money to pay itself the $17,486 it received."

The government refused to pay Morgan, and he sued for it. The case of J. Pierpont Morgan vs. The United States Government may be found in the commission's report as case No. 97. The commission agreed to pay $13.31 a carbine, but this offer was not satisfactory to the claimants. Stevens brought a suit for the full amount in the Court of Claims at Washington, and in 1867 Judge Peck decided in favor of Stevens. Y. R. RUCSAJ.

New York, April 10, 1915.

CANNERY SLAVERY

Some Facts Supplied by the Former Chief Investigator.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In The Tribune for April 15 appears a letter signed by E. S. Truesdell, of Binghamton, N. Y., which criticised methods used by the State Factory Investigating Commission and the accuracy of its findings. I resent his criticism and know it to be incorrect.

First—The time card of Miss Jennie Hackeman, who worked, according to the canner's own time card, 117½ hours in a week, was not taken from the canner's files by stealth. The inspector, with the full permission of the canner, took it and all the other time cards for the year to the commission's branch office at Syracuse to be transcribed. The card was photographed there.

Second—This card was furnished by the canner as a record of the correct hours of labor. I cannot see that the inspector should have gone behind the canner's own record, especially in light of the fact that the state law requires the canner to keep accurate time records.

Third—The statement that this woman's time card showed forty-nine hours more work for this week than any other time card in the factory is untrue, as the transcript of the time records on file with the Factory Commission show. These were the longest hours worked in the week, but other women also worked extreme hours.

Fourth—The endeavor by misrepresentation regarding this particular time card to discredit statements that women worked extreme hours in the canneries cannot go unchallenged. The commission had women investigators working in factories where the women were worked over 100 hours a week, and Mr. Roy Hemmingway, superintendent of the R. C. Hemmingway cannery at Auburn, N. Y., admitted under oath before the Factory Commission that his regular time records were false, and produced what he swore was a correct record showing that a Mrs. Donnelly worked 119¾ hours in a week, and that many other women worked almost as long. In the commission's report will be found a photograph of a pay envelope from this factory of a woman who worked 110 hours in a week for 10 cents an hour. The fact is absolutely unassailable that even if Miss Jennie Hackeman's time record illegally recorded the hours of two persons, as is alleged, some unscrupulous canners have worked women almost unbelievably long hours.

My conclusion is that Mr. Truesdell, with his great desire to protect the public from misrepresentation, had better tend to his own barnyard before he endeavors to discredit investigators who have honestly endeavored to discover the truth and have succeeded in doing so.

ZENAS L. POTTER.

Former Chief Cannery Investigator, New York State Factory Investigating Commission.

New York, April 15, 1915.

A Unitarian Revival.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Associated with the oldest of the New York City Unitarian churches, All Souls', my attention was called to your wise editorial of yesterday entitled, "Playing Into Billy Sunday's Hands." I think there is a slight misapprehension about the purpose Mr. Wiers, of Montclair, and perhaps others have in hiring a hall and starting what some might think opposition services of Paterson.

But Unitarians had the experience recently in Philadelphia of an unprecedented awakening, for as one of the results of Sunday's denunciation all the churches there, including the one at Germantown, were filled to overflowing on all the days of the week—not merely Sundays. And if as a reaction—a reflex action, you might say—Sunday creates an interest in Unitarianism which no other agency could or would create, they no doubt think the opportunity too promising to be omitted.

In Philadelphia many thousands—perhaps I should say tens of thousands—of Unitarian pamphlets were distributed, taken from the racks at the church doors; and as the supply of such literature is practically unlimited, the demand for it is likely to be supplied. G. R. B.

The Conning Tower

TOLERANCE.

That mystic spray that lights the sparkling eye,
Alack, 'tis but the devil's deadly brew—
Base belladonna—and that brow, arched high,
Some pythoness with poisoned pencil drew.

The thrill of youth and hope and love and life
That sends the glowing color to the cheek,
Cannot be feigned. The rabbit's foot is rife
With shameless blushes that deceit bespeak.

Those tawdry tinted tresses and that smile
From painted lips, those languid lids suggest
The vulgar and the vicious and the vile.
Vain artifices all,—and self-confessed.

Thank Heav'n, thy natural charms are quite enough
To keep unsoiled thy form and soul, dear Rose,
Yet I'll deny thee not thy powder puff,
It hides those funny freckles on thy nose!

A. R. N.

"These 72-hour-a-week injustices are nothing," said a golf widow yesterday. "During the golf season my husband is away from home 104 hours a week; and when he is at home his mind is on golf. There Ought to Be a Law."

And a contrib's wife—D. H. R.—says that her husband puts in 73 hours a week at unsuccessful contribbing. "And he doesn't get 5c an hour for it," she adds.

TRIBUTE TO THE FIRE-FIGHTERS OF RIDGEFIELD PARK IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICE AT THE ADLER FIRE.

[Robert J. Barnett in The Ridgefield Park Bulletin.]

Last Monday morn at ten o'clock
The bull-horn shrieked aloud,
One-one, two, three—thirteen, three times
An alarm with superstition endowed.

The response of the men whose duty it was
To fight the smoke and flames,
Was evidence of heroic desire
As swift to the scene they came.

The fire-lads needed no direction
To the Orchard Street garage,
Little did they know what danger lay there
Amid the vapor emitting in volumes large.

Bang, puff—a tongue of flames
Swept northward fifty feet or more
In the path where the gallant fighters stood
It raged like a billowy wave against the shore.

And ere the atmosphere was cleared
Eight victims it had lured,
Some singed, some scorched, others badly burned,
Oh! what suffering must have been endured.

These brave men had done their duty,
Performed it well and murmured not.
Yes, and they'll repeat the risk
When recovered from their now unfortunate lot.

Ye who unjustly criticise
Give thought to an earnest plea
For the men who deserve an exalted praise
No nobler servants can there be.

Their hearts are filled with kindness,
They give no thought to strife,
All their efforts bend toward
Saving man's property and life.

Here's to our worthy fire-fighters
The pride of Ridgefield Park,
Compared with departments near and afar
They're crowding the hundred percentage mark.

Perhaps there are weightier matters for discussion than the facts that Mrs. S. J. Kidder has been elected Chairman of Courtesies of the Iowa New Yorkers and Bouquet & Son are florists out Gravesend way.

At Last Comes One to Join Us!

[William Marion Reedy in the St. Louis Mirror.]

All the "littery fellers" have been driving it into me for three or four years that Joseph Conrad is *the* great contemporary writer. And I cannot see him that way at all. "Almayer's Folly," is a good book, even a fine big book; "Youth" is rather too much of itself; "Under Western Skies" is Dostolevsky without the Russian's psychological percipience. Now come "A Set of Six" and "Victory," published by Doubleday, Page & Co. "A Set of Six" is a collection of short stories—good enough stories, but once Conrad is started one wonders if he will ever be done. He deliberately holds back his story. He always has the brake on. He simply won't let the story tell itself, and he won't tell it as if he really wants to tell it. Oh, but think of his style! Well, it's well to have a style, but I submit it is no part of a style's business to get in the way of a story and clog it and make it drag. So it is with "Victory." There's a story in a splendid setting, but,—Heavens and Earth!—to get the story is like pulling a cat backward out of a boot-leg. There are characters that never become quite real, and the reason for all the long-drawn narrative at the flow-speed of cold molasses is not quite clear. There are villains who talk hifalutin and pedestrian speech and prosecute their villainy with no logic of the art of the story, that I can see. The climax is a sort of slaughterhouse scene—everybody is wiped out at once. Sheer melodrama dangerously near a burlesque of itself. And the reading of it is like a long march on a sand road. There's style here and there—yes. But it is no relief. I submit that Joseph Conrad is overcome by his style and so are his readers. The "littery fellers" are all wrong. A style should help a story, not hamper it. When there's an intolerable deal of style and it loads the story down like lead,—there is no style at all. And Joseph Conrad's style makes even the story of his own development into a writer a most lugubrious bore. If he will forget himself and give himself up to his story he will find a real style. Now, the reading of him is simply hard work and not worth it in the end.

. . . 25,000 "rooters" . . .
"Matty" wasn't "there."
. . . the "grand old man" . . .
. . . the downcast "fans" . . .
. . . "Larry" McLean . . .
. . . the Dodgers' "big three" . . .
. . . "Big Six needs warm weather to "bake out" his arm.

We are "quoting" the Evening Telegram.

Helen Hathaway . . . now the wife of a well-to-do multi-millionaire . . .—The Tribune.

If there's one thing we can't stand, it's an impecunious millionaire.

The Tribune's Syracuse correspondent obviously has a notion that the Colonel won't run in 1916. His dispatch refers to him as "the former ex-President."

Seats in the last line of benches in the Supreme Court at Syracuse, Louis Seibold wires, are at a premium.

Our lastline, though, is unpurchasable.

F. P. A.